

U.S. Department of Homeland Security

Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS OFFICE 425 Eye Street N.W. BCIS, AAO, 20 Mass, 3/F Washington, D.C. 20536

File:

Petition:

WAC 01 217 53764

Office: CALIFORNIA SERVICE CENTER

Date:

APR 11 ZUUJ

IN RE: Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Multinational Executive or Manager Pursuant to Section

203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



PUBLIC COPY

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services (Bureau) where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. *Id*.

Any motion must be filed with the office that originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. § 103.7.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The preference visa petition was denied by the Director, California Service Center. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office on appeal. The appeal will be summarily dismissed.

The petitioner is engaged in the business of trading textile products. It seeks to employ the beneficiary as its vice president. Accordingly, the petitioner endeavors to classify the beneficiary as an employment-based immigrant pursuant to section 203(b)(1)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(1)(C), as a multinational executive or manager. The director denied the petition because the petitioner failed to establish that it has a qualifying relationship with a foreign entity. The director also concluded that the beneficiary has not been employed in a managerial or executive capacity, either for the company abroad or for the U.S. entity. Finally, the director determined that the petitioner failed to establish that it has the ability to pay the beneficiary's proffered wage.

On appeal, counsel states that the director erred in denying the petition and further claims that the director abused her discretion and failed to consider relevant evidence. Although counsel did not expand on any of his arguments he indicated his intention to submit a written brief within 30 days of the director's denial, dated March 7, 2002. To date, however, nearly one year after the denial was issued, no brief has been received. Therefore, the record must be considered complete as presently constituted.

The regulations at 8 C.F.R. § 103.3(a)(1)(v) state, in pertinent part:

An officer to whom an appeal is taken shall summarily dismiss any appeal when the party concerned fails to identify specifically any erroneous conclusion of law or statement of fact for the appeal.

Inasmuch as counsel has failed to identify specifically an erroneous conclusion of law or a statement of fact in this proceeding, the appeal will be summarily dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is summarily dismissed.